

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2002

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING, ASSESSMENT, AND
PERFORMANCE FUNDING**

MINUTES

May 21, 2002

**S. C. Commission on Higher Education
Large Conference Room**

Committee Members Present

Ms. Margaret Addison
Ms. Lorraine Dimery
Dr. Vermelle Johnson
M. G. Thomas R. Olsen, Sr.
Mr. Daniel Ravenel

M. G. Thomas R. Olsen, Sr. opened the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

1. Consideration of the Minutes of the December 13, 2001 Meeting

It was moved (Ravenel), seconded (Johnson) and voted to adopt the minutes of December 13, 2001 as written. (Attachment 1)

2. Consideration of Change in Mission Statements for USC Beaufort from a Two-Year Campus of USC to a Four-Year Campus of USC

M. G. Olsen gave a brief overview of the process of review for the proposed mission change. He explained that two public hearings were held: one on April 29 in Beaufort and one on May 1 in CHE's large conference room. 250 people attended in all; 54 speakers spoke in favor of the change on April 29 with 2 speaking against. 30 spoke in favor of the change on May 1, and none spoke against the change. M. G. Olsen also stated that the County of Beaufort has publicly pledged a Tax Incentive Fund (TIF) to help pay for the New River Campus. Because of the TIF, USCB is not asking for any additional funding from the State for an estimated five (5) years.

Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong went through each criteria CHE staff considered in evaluating the compelling needs of the State and Region. She stated that staff evaluated all issues pertinent to this review and found that USCB has satisfactorily met the necessary criteria for a mission change to a baccalaureate degree institution.

Dr. Rayburn Barton, CHE Executive Director, extended his gratitude to USCB's staff for working so cooperatively with CHE staff and for going the extra mile in providing information on a timely schedule. Dr. Barton explained that each CHE division worked on this recommendation, and all aspects of the proposal have been reviewed. He stated that this is a unanimous recommendation of the CHE staff. Also, he also stated that USCB will receive the same amount of appropriations received in previous years, and USCB will eligible for funding as a four-year institution as of July 1, 2002. The floor was opened for comments from Committee members

and audience.

Mr. Daniel Ravenel gave brief remarks and indicated his support for this proposal.

Dr. Vermelle Johnson commented that, when the transitional plan is written by USCB, connectivity with USC Columbia and with the Technical College of the Lowcountry will be a necessary part of the plan.

It was moved (Olsen) seconded (Addison) and voted to approve USCB's request for a proposed mission change to a four-year institution as of July 1, 2002, based on the condition that USCB complies with the recommendation to better clarify the size of the institution during its next mission statement review and submits a transitional plan by September 1, 2002, and to forward this recommendation to the full Commission for consideration. (Attachment 2)

Dr. Jane Upshaw, President, USCB, thanked the committee for the approval on behalf of the Lowcountry and USCB.

3. Consideration of Change in Mission Statements for USC-Salkehatchie, Aiken Technical College, Florence-Darlington Technical College, and Tri-County Technical College

M.G. Olsen stated he would recommend that the mission statements be considered as a whole. He then asked Dr. Ulmer-Sottong to discuss the changes.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong summarized the changes as follows:

1. USC Salkehatchie is removing the phrase "Developmental Courses" from its mission statement.
2. Aiken Technical College is making a minor language change to clarify its mission.
3. Florence-Darlington Technical College mission changes have to do with increasing enrollment and distance education offerings of the institution.
4. Tri-County Technical College reflects a change in the name of their Special Schools Program and changes headings of some of their values statements.

The floor was opened for comments. There were no comments from committee members or institutional representatives.

It was moved (Olsen) seconded (Johnson) and voted to approve the staff recommendation for revised changes to mission statements for USC-Salkehatchie, Aiken Technical College, Florence-Darlington Technical College, and Tri-County Technical College and to forward its recommendation to the full Commission for consideration. (Attachment 3)

4. Consideration of Institutional Performance Ratings for 2001-02 to Impact FY 2002-03 (PF Year 6)

M. G. Olsen explained that this would be the first year in which performance is evaluated on 13-14 indicators. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong reviewed a summary of this year's ratings process. She then explained that the Committee would be presented with some appeals from the institutions. She

asked that the Committee first consider ratings of indicators that are not appealed and then to consider the indicators that have appeals.

M.G. Olsen gave a brief overview of the appeals as follows:

1. Research Institutions appealed Indicator 2A, Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors.
2. College of Charleston appealed Indicator 3D, Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs
3. USC Salkehatchie appealed Indicator 2A, Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors.
4. Northeastern Technical College appealed Indicators 2D, Compensation of Faculty; Indicator 3D, Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs; and Indicator 7D, Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, or Employment Related Examinations and Certification Tests.

In addition to these staff brought forward additional considerations including: an issue for MUSC related to data on 5A Percentage of Administrative Costs to Academic Costs that came to the attention of the staff only several days ago; and an issue for Clemson and Williamsburg Technical College; issue related to data changes due to changes in IPEDS survey data made after the mail-out.

M.G. Olsen recommended that the Committee take a vote on all of the recommended ratings except for those appealed items of the institutions, as indicated, and then go back and discuss the appeals individually.

The floor was opened for discussion. There being none, it was moved (Olsen) seconded (Ravenel) and voted to accept the staff recommendations of the institutional ratings for 2001-02 to Impact FY 2002-03 (Attachment 4) that do not have an appeal and to forward its recommendation to the full Commission for consideration.

M.G. Olsen explained that the appeals would be voted on paper ballots.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong gave a summary of all appeals as follows:

Indicator 2A: Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors (Research Sector). The research sector believes that instructors should not be counted in this indicator, and believes that staff made this agreement to delete instructors from this indicator last year.

Staff recommends that this indicator and discussion of it be referred to the Planning, Assessment, and Performance Funding Advisory Committee for their first meeting on June 14, 2002.

Dr. Harry Matthews, USC, asked that the Committee come back to this issue after the Advisory Committee has met and not postpone this issue until this time next year.

It was moved (Olsen) seconded (Ravenel) and voted to accept the staff recommendation to postpone this appeal until the Advisory Committee has a chance to meet. Staff will present it's recommendation before the Committee on September 5, 2002. (Attachment 4)

Indicator 2A: USC Salkehatchie. USC Salkehatchie presented data to staff of its performance in past years using the current definition of this indicator. Historical data for this indicator were unavailable to staff due to definitional changes applicable this year. Staff found that the data presented by USC Salkehatchie shows that USC Salkehatchie exceeded the 3% improvement expectation. Therefore, staff supported their appeal for a change in their score from a 2 to 2.5 in recognition of improvement.

The floor was opened for comments and discussion. There were none.

It was moved (Olsen) seconded (Ravenel) and voted to accept the staff recommendation to change the score from a 2 to 2.5 for USC Salkehatchie. (Attachment 4)

Indicator 3D: College of Charleston. The College of Charleston appealed to the Committee for a change in performance score that would take into account extenuating circumstances related to the Theater Program not being accredited. The program was on track for accreditation and scheduled for a visit by the accrediting team prior to September 11th tragedy. The College expects to be granted accreditation by the next reporting period, Performance Year 2002-03.

Staff recommended that the score remain unchanged because the accreditation visit has not been rescheduled.

The floor was opened for comments and discussion. There were none.

It was moved (Olsen) seconded (Ravenel) to accept the staff recommendation. The floor was opened for discussion. Dr. Robert Mignone, College of Charleston, requested that the appeal be removed. (Attachment 4)

Indicator 2D: Northeastern Technical College. Northeastern Technical College presented data that showed a decline in performance due to the retirement of a senior faculty member and the hiring of a replacement at a lesser salary coupled with difficulty in filling a recently vacated position.

In the past, staff has supported similar appeals made when data supported that the retirement of senior faculty members and the hiring of replacements at a lower salary level impacted performance. Therefore, staff recommended a score change from 1 to 2.5 for this indicator indicated by recalculated data taking the circumstances into consideration.

The floor was opened for comments and discussion. There were none.

It was moved (Olsen) seconded (Ravenel) and voted to accept the staff recommendation for a change in score for Northeastern Technical College on Indicator 2D from 1 to 2.5. (Attachment 4)

It was moved (Ravenel) seconded (Addison) and voted to return to a voice vote for appeals for the remainder of this meeting.

Indicator 3D: Northeastern Technical College. The college expressed that because of their size this indicator presents an undue financial burden. The College cited that accreditation would cost \$18,300 at a minimum and believed that this money could be spent on other institutional priorities.

Staff recommended against this appeal indicator that size should not determine whether a student should be able to graduate from an accredited program in an area for which national accreditation is recognized. It was acknowledged that cost issues may be prohibitive for smaller institutions but that most state institutions have made progress in this area.

The floor was opened for comments and discussion. There were none.

It was moved (Olsen) seconded (Johnson) and voted to accept the staff recommendation for Northeastern Technical College of no change of scoring for Indicator 3D. (Attachment 4)

Indicator 7D: Northeastern Technical College. The College cited its small size as impacting performance on the indicator. The college explained that it has one program that requires an exam, which is the Nursing Program and that it is a small program on their campus making up less than 3% of their total enrollment. They also pointed out recent changes in the exam structure to a computerized format resulted in a reduced passing rate. The college explained its efforts to work with students to improve scores on this exam.

Staff recommended against this appeal as it found that the issues presented by the college relative to its performance are similar issues faced by other colleges

The floor was opened for comments and discussion. There were none.

It was moved (Olsen) seconded (Johnson) and voted to accept the staff recommendation for Northeastern Technical College of no change of scoring for Indicator 7D. (Attachment 4)

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong asked the committee for advice and a vote on three additional data issues. The following three issues are:

Indicator 5A, Percentage of Administrative Costs to Academic Costs: MUSC. This data issue was brought to the attention of staff only several days ago, making it too late for a formal appeal by this institution. Essentially, MUSC explained to staff that changes in performance on this indicator were impacted by the creation of the hospital authority. The impact to the data was outlined by staff in a handout provided to the Committee. The information showed that, had the hospital authority not been created, MUSC's performance on this indicator would have been scored as "3" rather than "1."

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated that had this issue been presented as an appeal to the staff, staff would have recommended a change in score to "3" in considering the impact of the creation of the authority. She explained that such a change in score would affect the overall score for MUSC – changing it from "Exceeds" to "Substantially Exceeds."

M.G. Olsen explained that this was an accounting factor that MUSC had no control over. He further stated that although this is not the normal procedure to consider appeals that have come in late, he would support it. However, in the future, he does not expect late appeals to occur routinely.

It was moved (Olsen) seconded (Johnson) and voted to change the score for MUSC from a "1" to a "3" on Indicator 5A and to change the overall score from "Exceeds" to "Substantially Exceeds." (Attachment 5)

Indicator 5A: Clemson University and Williamsburg Technical College. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong explained that for Clemson and Williamsburg Technical College changes concerning Indicator 5A also came to light following the mail-out and resulted in data changes that have impacted recommended indicator scores for these institutions. Staff reported that corrections made recently to IPEDS data as noted on the handout resulted in a performance change for Clemson from 6.6% to 5.9%. For Clemson, no scoring changes resulted. For Williamsburg Technical College, the corrected data results in a change in performance from 91.3% to 42.4%, changing the indicator score to 1.5 and the overall score to 2.52. The committee approved of these changes. (Attachment 5)

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong also described for the Committee corrections to information provided on the report cards. Numbers found on page 1 for full-time faculty will be corrected and the report card headers will be corrected to accurately reflect the performance year. The changes were detailed in the handout provided to the Committee. The Committee accepted this information. (Attachment 5)

5. Other Business

M.G. Olsen announced that the first meeting of the advisory committee to the Planning and Assessment Committee that is being formed at present will be held on June 14. The meeting will be in CHE's large conference room at 10:30 a.m. and will end at 2:30 p.m. Lunch will not be provided. The Committee will begin discussions on Indicators 2A, 3D, and 7D. An agenda will be mailed out by June 8th. Staff will be working with institutional representatives on six indicators that will come before the committee on September 5.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Saundra E. Carr
Recording Secretary

Attachments referenced in minutes are available upon request.